

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 3, 2004, (Paper No. 19) claims 1–61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,144,644 to *Bajzath et al* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,841 to *Bull*. The rejection is respectfully traversed in light of the amendment.

Claims 19, 24, 33, 44 and 53–55 have been amended to include audible identification information being provided over both a subscriber line and a computer network. Claims 20 and 48 have been cancelled, and claims 21, 29, 30, and 39 have been amended to conform to the amendments made in claims 19, 24, 33 and 44. Claims 1–19, 21–47 and 49–61 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendment and the following remarks.

The Rejection of the Claims under § 103(a) over *Bajzath* in view of *Bull* is Addressed:

Claims 1–61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Bajzath* in view of *Bull*. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the combination of *Bajzath* and *Bull* does not describe or suggest all the elements of the claims. As stated in the Office Action on page 2, *Bajzath* does not teach several of the steps recited in claim 1, including:

- c) in response to step b), prompting the caller to provide identification;
- d) receiving an audible identification from the caller; and
- e) providing the caller audible identification to the subscriber.

Bajzath shows that non-audible caller information may be sent through a computer network (e.g., the Internet) to a device (e.g., a computer) connected to the computer network via a subscriber line. However, the reference does not describe or suggest that a caller attempting to call a subscriber line having a device connected to a computer network can provide audible caller identification to the device both "via the computer network and the subscriber line," as described in claim 1.

Bull, which describes a network for sending audible caller identification to a receiver's telephone, is introduced in an attempt to supply the elements missing in *Bajzath*. The

network in *Bull* may be implemented in either a communications network or, alternatively, in a computer network, but nothing in the reference suggests the network is a combination of a computer and communications network. *See* col. 3, lines 11–14. The description in *Bull* suggests that the computer network replace, instead of complement, a subscriber line communications network. Accordingly, *Bull* can't suggest that audible caller identification be sent via both a computer network and a subscriber line. Thus, neither *Bajzath* nor *Bull*, either alone or in combination, suggest "providing the audible identification via the computer network and the subscriber line" as recited in step e) of claim 1.

Independent claims 19, 24, 33, 44 and 53–55 have been amended to also include having audible identification information provided via both a computer network and a subscriber line. Thus, these claims, and the claims that depend from them, are allowable over the combination of *Bajzath* and *Bull* for at least the reason given above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Bajzath* in view of *Bull* is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe claims 1–19, 21–47 and 49–61 are allowable, and that the Application is in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Eugene J. Bernard
Reg. No. 42,320

Date: July 21, 2004

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
G3B/jln
60244122 v1